



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,876	09/14/2000	Joshua Haghpasand		9275

7590
Steven Horowitz
Counselor at Law
295 Madison Avenue
Suite 700
New York, NY 10017

EXAMINER

SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/661,876	Applicant(s) HAGHPASSAND, JOSHUA	
	Examiner Jeffrey R. Swearingen	Art Unit 2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9,10,14-17,20,21,23,24,32-34,51,52,55,56,59-79 and 115-118 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-10, 14-17, 20-21, 23-24, 32-34, 51-52, 55-56, 59-79, and 115-118 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/5/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant argued only the Fuh reference, and failed to address Adoba at all.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 9-10, 14-17, 20-21, 23-24, 32-34, 51-52, 55-56, 59-79, and 115-118 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 14-17, 20-21, 23-24, 32-34, 51-52, 55-56, 59-79, and 115-118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuh et al. (US 6,463,474) in view of Brown et al. (US 5,941,947, and in further view of Adoba et al. (RFC 2607: Proxy Chaining and Policy Implementation in Roaming, June 1999).

6. In regard to claims 1 and 5, Fuh disclosed a firewall protecting against unwanted traffic that is inbound or outbound. Fuh, column 7, lines 41-47. Fuh performed an authentication procedure to ensure

Art Unit: 2145

access. Fuh, column 7, lines 48-61. Fuh held profiles that could be configured and stored for multiple users and administrators. Fuh, column 8, lines 29-37. Fuh filtered traffic based upon an access control list for input or output. Fuh, column 9, lines 31-54.

7. Fuh failed to disclose the profiles had different access levels. Fuh failed to disclose the editing of the access control lists. However, Brown disclosed a security server which managed user groups where a specified user could possess different levels of access to the network. Brown, column 4, lines 40-65. Brown, column 17, line 25- column 18, line 5. Brown correlated each user's access levels with an alterable access rights list. Brown, column 25, lines 14-39. Brown, column 26, lines 28-65. Brown and Fuh are both analogous pieces of art, since both are network administration systems that teach basic network administrative functions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the specific user profiles and access lists of Brown with the firewall of Fuh in order for a more customizable firewall proxy security system to be installed. Fuh, column 1, lines 12-31; column 2, lines 55-64. Brown, column 1, lines 28-56; column 2, lines 11-16.

8. Fuh in view of Brown failed to disclose the use of proxy chaining. Fuh did disclose the use of a single proxy. However, Adoba disclosed the use of proxy chaining in roaming network systems. See Adoba, Introduction, Adoba, Proxy chaining. Adoba was for roaming mobile network systems. Fuh likewise was designed to be flexible enough to allow for mobile systems. Fuh, column 8, lines 49-64 refer to the use of multiple modems or ISDN channels. Fuh, column 17, lines 13-27 disclose the use of communications over wireless links, modems, telephone lines, and ISDN. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use proxy chaining, as illustratively taught by Adoba, with a mobile proxy system such as the combination of Fuh in view of Brown, for added security and privacy while surfing the Internet and accessing data.

9. In regard to claims 2 and 6, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba further disclosed:

the second proxy server has all the characteristics of a first proxy server but has an empty unfriendly outbound list. Adoba teaches in section 5 that some of the proxy servers will not have all of the accounting data.

10. In regard to claims 3, 64, 66, and 72, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

Art Unit: 2145

a third proxy server and/or additional proxy servers forward inbound requests for resources to proxy servers other than the first and second proxy servers.

Adoba, Proxy Chaining

11. In regard to claims 4, 23, and 33, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

the system is compatible with dialup modem connection to the Internet, the system is compatible with a local area network and the system is compatible with virtual network connection.

Fuh, column 7, line 17

12. In regard to claims 15, 17, 21, 24, 32, and 34, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

the range of access levels ranges from allowing all access to allowing no access at all.

Allowing all traffic through the Access Control list in column 9 of Fuh was allowing all access. Denying all traffic through an Access Control List in Fuh, column 9 was allowing no access at all. See further Brown, column 21, lines 5-24 and Brown, column 17, line 25 – column 18, line 22.

13. In regard to claims 9-10, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

said administrative module being capable of also creating a fourth type of user account namely one anonymous guest user account to be used by general users without authentication credentials. The different types of accounts are inherent to Cisco routers using the IOS as disclosed in Fuh, column 1, lines 41-57. Cisco IOS supported an administrator account and other user accounts with varying access levels at the time of the invention. See further Brown, column 21, lines 5-24 and Brown, column 17, line 25 – column 18, line 22.

14. In regard to claims 14, and 16, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

a first proxy server is in each and every user computer. Fuh, column 17, lines 42-61.

15. In regard to claims 51-52, 55-56, and 115-118, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

said first proxy server is also programmed to register the request in a logfile of all websites requested by a user. Column 5, lines 39-42.

16. In regard to claims 59 and 68, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

Art Unit: 2145

the first proxy server is programmed to check the identity of a user who logs into the first proxy server and who presents a unique authentication credential prior to checking the identity of the requesting client and/or requested URL against the list or lists.

Fuh, column 12, lines 38-56

17. In regard to claims 60, 69, 75, 78, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

the first proxy server is programmed, upon a successful authentication of the user's credential, to use a configuration of the user's account to check the identity of the requesting client and/or requested URL against the list or lists. Fuh, column 12, lines 38-56

18. In regard to claims 61, 70, 76, 79, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

the first proxy server is programmed that if said first proxy server fails to authenticate the user, then the first proxy server offers that user an opportunity to log in as an anonymous guest user. Fuh, column 12, lines 38-56. The authentication procedure of Fuh inherently allowed a user to attempt to log in again after the first login attempt failed.

19. In regard to claims 62, 65, 67, 73, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

a third proxy server and/or additional proxy servers forward the outbound requests for access to websites to other proxy servers other than the first and second proxy servers. Adoba, Proxy chaining.

20. In regard to claims 63 and 71, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

inbound communications are arranged so that an actual location of an important resource is located in an unpublished location that is a replacement location to which requests rejected by the first proxy server are rerouted, wherein clients of approved users are listed in the first proxy server in the unfriendly inbound list and are sent by the first proxy server to the replacement location, and wherein clients of unapproved users are not listed in the unfriendly inbound list and have their request sent to a published address that contains unimportant information. Fuh, column 9, lines 20-55

21. In regard to claims 74, 77, Fuh in view of Brown in further view of Adoba disclosed:

the first proxy server is programmed to check the identity of a user who logs into the first proxy server and who presents a unique authentication credential against a valid user account prior to checking

Art Unit: 2145

the identity of the requesting client and/or requested URL against the list or lists. Fuh, column 12, lines 38-56.

Conclusion

- 22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 23. Win et al. US 6,161,139
- 24. Win et al. US 6,453,353

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571)272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey R. Swearingen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2145

/Jeffrey R. Swearingen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2145